

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 UTHERVERSE GAMING LLC,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 EPIC GAMES, INC.,

13 Defendant.  
14  
15  
16

Case No. 2:21-cv-00799-RSM

**JOINT STATEMENT OF DISPUTED  
PROPOSED VERDICT FORMS**

17 Plaintiff Utherverse Gaming LLC (“Utherverse Gaming”) and Defendant Epic Games,  
18 Inc. (“Epic Games”) propose competing verdict forms. Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 51(f), this  
19 Joint Statement of Disputed Proposed Verdict Forms presents each party’s proposal followed by  
20 a position statement in support.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**PLAINTIFF UThERVERSE GAMING’S PROPOSED VERDICT FORM**

**Instructions:** When answering the following questions and completing this Verdict Form, you must follow the instructions provided and follow the Jury Instructions that you have been given. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in the Jury Instructions. You must refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

As used herein:

1. “Utherverse Gaming” refers to Plaintiff Utherverse Gaming LLC.
2. “Epic Games” refers to Defendant Epic Games, Inc.
3. The “’605 Patent” refers to U.S. Patent No. 9,724,605.
4. The “asserted claims” refers to claims 2, 5, and 8 of the ’605 Patent.
5. The “accused events” refers to two virtual events created and implemented by Epic Games in its multiplayer online videogame Fortnite: the Travis Scott and Ariana Grande Events.

1 We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

2  
3 **QUESTION NO 1.** Has Utherverse Gaming proven by a preponderance of the evidence that  
4 either or both of the accused events infringed at least one of the asserted claims?  
5

6 Check “YES” (for Utherverse Gaming) or “NO” (for Epic Games).

7 **a. '605 Patent Claim 2**

8 i. Travis Scott Events

9 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

10 ii. Ariana Grande Events

11 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
12

13 **b. '605, Patent, Claim 5**

14 i. Travis Scott Events

15 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

16 ii. Ariana Grande Events

17 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
18

19 **c. '605, Patent, Claim 8**

20 i. Travis Scott Events

21 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

22 ii. Ariana Grande Events

23 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
24  
25

26 *Please proceed to Question No. 2.*  
27  
28

1 **QUESTION NO. 2.** Has Epic Games proven by clear and convincing evidence that the  
2 following claims of the '605 Patent are invalid?

3 Check "YES" (for Epic Games) or "NO" (for Utherverse Gaming)

4 **a. '605 Patent Claim 2**

5 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

6 **b. '605, Patent, Claim 5**

7 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

8 **c. '605, Patent, Claim 8**

9 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 *If you answered "YES" for one or more claims in Question No. 1 for either accused event and also*  
15 *answered "NO" to Question No. 2 for those same claims (in other words, you found at least one*  
16 *claim infringed and not invalid), then please proceed to Question No. 3. Otherwise please skip to the*  
17 *last page, sign and date the verdict form, and return it to the court clerk.*  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **QUESTION NO. 3.** What is the total amount of damages Utherville Gaming has proven by a  
2 preponderance of the evidence that would compensate Utherville Gaming for Epic Games'  
3 infringement of the '605 Patent?  
4

5 \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
6  
7

8 **QUESTION NO. 4.** If you entered an amount of damages for Question No. 5, did that amount  
9 reflect a calculation of percentage royalty damages, or a one-time lump sum royalty payment?

10 Percentage Royalty \_\_\_\_\_

11 One-Time Lump Sum Royalty Payment \_\_\_\_\_  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 Please sign and date below and return this verdict form to the court clerk.  
18  
19

20 **Presiding Juror:** \_\_\_\_\_  
21

22 **Dated:** \_\_\_\_\_  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **Plaintiff's Position:**

2 Defendant proposes that the jurors answer *four* separate questions regarding invalidity.  
3 Defendant's proposal is prejudicial in that it places undue emphasis on invalidity. The jury  
4 instructions will already direct the jury as to each of the bases for invalidity and to find the  
5 claims invalid if Defendant carries its burden, and juries are presumed to follow the instructions.  
6 *GPNE Corp. v. Apple Inc.*, 108 F. Supp. 3d 839, 859 (N.D. Cal. 2015). Repeating the bases for  
7 invalidity with separate questions is unnecessarily duplicative when the Federal Circuit has held  
8 generic verdict are sufficient. *See, e.g., Structural Rubber Prods. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d  
9 707, 720 (Fed. Cir. 1984) ("a trial court may, with proper instructions, present a patent case to  
10 the jury for a general verdict encompassing all of the issues of validity and infringement, or may  
11 ask for a general answer on one or more specific legal issues.") (internal citations omitted). "The  
12 specificity of the verdict is within the discretion of the trial judge," *Hoechst Celanese Corp. v.*  
13 *BP Chemicals Ltd.*, 78 F.3d 1575, 1581 (Fed. Cir. 1996), and in this case the Court should use  
14 general questions.

15 Further, Defendant cites the sample verdict form of the N.D. Cal. model patent  
16 instructions in support of its multiple invalidity questions. However, the model sample verdict  
17 form's questions on anticipation (Defendant's Question 2), obviousness (Defendant's Question  
18 3), and enablement (Defendant's Question 4) provide much more context and guidance than do  
19 Defendant's proposals, and Defendant's Question 5 is not present in the model sample verdict  
20 form at all. *See* N.D. Cal. Model Patent Jury Instruction No. C.3. If the Court elects to follow  
21 the sample verdict form from the model, it should use the more fulsome explanations, rather than  
22 Defendant's truncated versions.

23

24

25

26

27

28

**DEFENDANT EPIC GAMES' PROPOSED VERDICT FORM**

**Instructions:** When answering the following questions and completing this Verdict Form, please follow the instructions provided and follow the Jury Instructions that you have been given. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in the Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

As used herein:

“Utherverse” refers to Plaintiff Utherverse Gaming LLC.

“Epic” refers to Defendant Epic Games, Inc.

The “’605 patent” refers to U.S. Patent No. 9,724,605.

The “asserted claims” refers to claims 2, 5, and 8 of the ’605 patent.

The “accused events” refers to two events hosted by Epic in its multiplayer online videogame *Fortnite*: the Travis Scott and Ariana Grande concerts.

1 We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

2  
3 **QUESTION NO 1.** Has Utherverse proven by a preponderance of the evidence that either of  
4 the accused events infringed any of the asserted claims?

5 Check “YES” (for Utherverse) or “NO” (for Epic)

PATENT/CLAIM	INFRINGED – TRAVIS SCOTT?	INFRINGED – ARIANA GRANDE?
'605 patent, claim 2	YES _____ NO _____	YES _____ NO _____
'605 patent, claim 5	YES _____ NO _____	YES _____ NO _____
'605 patent, claim 8	YES _____ NO _____	YES _____ NO _____

12 *Please proceed to Question No. 2.*



**QUESTION NO. 2.** Has Epic proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the asserted claims is anticipated by the prior art?

Check “YES” (for Epic) or “NO” (for Utherverse)

PATENT/CLAIM	INVALID AS ANTICIPATED BY THE PRIOR ART?
'605 patent, claim 2	YES _____ NO _____
'605 patent, claim 5	YES _____ NO _____
'605 patent, claim 8	YES _____ NO _____

*Please proceed to Question 3.*

**QUESTION NO. 3.** Has Epic proven that by clear and convincing evidence that any of the asserted claims is invalid as obvious based on the prior art?

Check “YES” (for Epic) or “NO” (for Utherverse)

PATENT/CLAIM	INVALID AS OBVIOUS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART?
'605 patent, claim 2	YES _____ NO _____
'605 patent, claim 5	YES _____ NO _____
'605 patent, claim 8	YES _____ NO _____

*Please proceed to Question 4.*

**QUESTION NO. 4.** Has Epic proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the asserted claims are invalid for lack of enablement?

Check “YES” (for Epic) or “NO” (for Utherverse)

PATENT/CLAIM	INVALID FOR LACK OF ENABLEMENT?
'605 patent, claim 2	YES _____ NO _____
'605 patent, claim 5	YES _____ NO _____
'605 patent, claim 8	YES _____ NO _____

*Please proceed to Question 5.*

**QUESTION NO. 5.** Has Epic proven by clear and convincing evidence that the elements of any of the asserted claims, taken individually or together, involved only technology that a person of ordinary skill in the art would consider to be well-understood, routine, and conventional as of August 12, 2014?

PATENT/CLAIM	INVALID AS WELL-UNDERSTOOD, ROUTINE, AND CONVENTIONAL?
'605 patent, claim 2	YES _____ NO _____
'605 patent, claim 5	YES _____ NO _____
'605 patent, claim 8	YES _____ NO _____

*If you answered “YES” for one or more claims in Question No. 1 for either accused event and also answered “NO” to Questions Nos. 2-5 for those same claims (in other words, you found at least one claim infringed and not invalid), then please proceed to Question No. 6. Otherwise, please skip to the last page, sign and date the verdict form, and return it to the court clerk.*

**QUESTION NO. 6.** What is the total amount of damages Utherville has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to as a reasonable royalty for Epic's infringement?

Total Amount for Infringement: \$\_\_\_\_\_

**QUESTION NO. 7.** If you entered an amount of damages for Question No. 5, did that amount reflect a calculation of percentage royalty damages, or a one-time lump sum royalty payment:

TYPE OF DAMAGES	SELECT ONE
Percentage Royalty	<input type="checkbox"/>
One Time, Lump Sum Royalty Payment	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Please proceed to the last page, sign and date the verdict form, and return it to the court clerk.*

[illegible][illegible]

Case 2:21-cv-00799-RSM Document 457 Filed 05/11/25 Page 12 of 15

**UNANIMOUS VERDICT**

UPON REACHING A UNANIMOUS VERDICT ON EACH QUESTION ABOVE,  
EACH JUROR MUST SIGN BELOW.

We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the above questions and return them  
under the instructions of this Court as our verdict in this case.

_____  _____  _____  _____  _____  _____	_____  _____  _____  _____  _____  _____
--	--

1 **Defendant's Position:**

2       *Validity (Question Nos. 2-5):* Epic's proposal is consistent with the sample verdict form  
3 in the model jury instructions, which explicitly separates questions for each distinct invalidity  
4 theory. *See* N.D. Cal. Model Patent Jury Instruction No. C.3. This structure promotes clarity  
5 and ensures that a jury's findings are easily reviewable on appeal. *Cordance Corp. v.*  
6 *Amazon.com, Inc.*, 658 F.3d 1330, 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2011) ("due to the presentation of multiple  
7 invalidity theories and the jury's general verdict, it remains unclear upon which ground(s) the  
8 jury based its findings of invalidity"). Even where only one invalidity theory is at issue, such  
9 theory should be identified within the verdict form's question. For example, if the issue is  
10 obviousness, the verdict form should ask whether any of the asserted claims are "invalid as  
11 obvious based on the prior art." This approach, consistent with the sample verdict form,  
12 promotes clarity for the jury and preserves a clean record for appeal. The Court should therefore  
13 adopt Epic's proposal.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 DATED this 11th day of May, 2025

2 Respectfully submitted,

3  
4 Colby B. Springer (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
5 Miya Yusa (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
6 Iqra Iqbal (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
**POLSINELLI LLP**  
Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 2400  
7 San Francisco, CA 94111  
Tel: 415-248-2100  
8 Fax: 415-248-2101  
Email: cspringer@polsinelli.com  
9 Email: myusa@polsineilli.com  
Email: iiqbal@polsinelli.com

10 Mark T. Deming (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
11 **POLSINELLI PC**  
150 N. Riverside Place, Suite 3000  
12 Chicago, IL 60606  
Tel: 312-819-1900  
13 Fax: 312-819-1901  
Email: mdeming@polsinelli.com

14 Kathryn Gusmer Cole (admitted *pro hac*  
15 *vice*)  
J. Mark Wilson (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
16 **MOORE & VAN ALLEN LAW**  
100 North Tryon Street, Ste. 4700  
17 Charlotte, NC 28202  
Tel: (704) 331-1045  
18 Fax: (704) 409-5659  
Email: katecole@mvalaw.com  
19 Email: markwilson@mvalaw.com

/s/

Emily McNally (WSBA No. 60710)  
**POLSINELLI PC**  
1000 Second Avenue, Suite 3500  
Seattle, WA 98104  
Tel: 206-393-5400  
Fax: 206-393-5401  
Email: emcnally@polsinelli.com

Melenie Van (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
**POLSINELLI LLP**  
2049 Century Park East, Suite 2900  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Tel: (310) 229-1355  
Fax: (415) 276-8959  
Email: mvan@polsinelli.com

Jonathan Spivey (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
**POLSINELLI PC**  
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 6400  
Houston, TX 77002  
Tel.: (713) 374-1600  
Fax: (713) 374-1601  
Email: jspivey@polsinelli.com

**Attorneys for Plaintiff**  
**UTHERVERSE GAMING LLC**

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Daralyn J. Durie (*pro hac vice*)  
DDurie@mofo.com  
Timothy C. Saulsbury (*pro hac vice*)  
TSaulsbury@mofo.com  
Eric C. Wiener (*pro have vice*)  
EWiener@mofo.com  
Ramsey W. Fisher (*pro hac vice*)  
ramseyfisher@mofo.com  
Sara Doudar (*pro hac vice*)  
SDoudar@mofo.com  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
425 Market Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: 415-268-7000  
Facsimile: 415-268-7522

Katherine E. McNutt (*pro hac vice*)  
KMcNutt@mofo.com  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
707 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 6000  
Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543  
Telephone: 213-892-5200  
Facsimile: 213-892-5454

**Attorneys for Defendant  
EPIC GAMES, INC.**

Antoine M. McNamara  
(WSBA No. 41701)  
AMcNamara@perkinscoie.com  
Christina J. McCullough  
(WSBA No. 47147)  
CMcCullough@perkinscoie.com  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900  
Seattle, WA 98101-3099  
Telephone: 206-359-8000  
Facsimile: 206-359-9000

Bethany D. Bengfort  
bengfort@turnerboyd.com  
Turner Boyd Seraphine LLP  
155 Bovet Road, Suite 600  
San Mateo, CA 94402  
Telephone: 650-529-4752

Mark A. Lemley (*pro hac vice*)  
mlemley@lex-lumina.com  
LEX LUMINA PLLC  
745 Fifth Avenue, Suite 500  
New York, NY 10151  
Telephone: (646) 898-2055